

REMARKS

[0007] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the following remarks. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-24, 26-34, and 36-38 are currently pending
- Claims 3, 14, 25, and 35 were previously canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein
- Claims 1, 11, 13, 21, 23, 32, and 34 are amended herein

[0008] Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 11, 13, 21, 23, 32, and 34 is found in the originally-filed specification in at least paragraph [0124]. No new matter is being introduced thereby.

Cited Documents

[0009] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Lortz: Lortz, U.S. Patent No. 7,107,610
- Brezak: Brezak et al, European Patent No. EP1619856 A1
- Srinivasan: Srinivasan, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0026535
- Krishnan: Krishnan et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,222,856

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-10, 12-14, 16, 18-20, 22-25, 27, 29-31, 33-35, and 38 are Non-Obvious over Lortz in view of Brezak, in further view of Srinivasan

[0010] Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-10, 12-14, 16, 18-20, 22-25, 27, 29-31, 33-35, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Lortz in view of Brezak, in further view of Srinivasan. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and further requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. However, in spite of Applicant's traversal, without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the present application, Applicant hereby amends independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34 in the manner set forth above.

[0011] Furthermore, and as stated above, it is Applicant's understanding that Examiner Abrishamkar agreed that independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34, as amended as proposed during the interview, are patentable over at least the references of record. Nevertheless, Applicant hereby submits the following remarks with respect to Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34.

Independent Claim 1

[0012] For at least the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Lortz, Brezak, and Srinivasan neither teaches nor suggests at least the following features recited in independent Claim 1:

determining whether to authorize the operation as a function of whether the client user has been delegated administrative authority by a server administrator to perform the operation with respect to the resource, the administrative authority being independent of whether the client user is a member of an administrators group associated with any resource of the server, and the determining including searching for an entry in a registry that provides a path to a configuration file, the configuration file specifying possible methods that can be performed by a plurality of client users and where the server administrator can add an entry for each of the plurality of client users;

More particularly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Lortz, Brezak, and Srinivasan does not disclose or suggest “the determining including searching for an entry in a registry that provides a path to a configuration file, the configuration file specifying possible methods that can be performed by a plurality of client users and where the server administrator can add an entry for each of the plurality of client users,” as presently recited in Claim 1.

[0013] Rather, the Examiner-cited Lortz reference discloses that “[e]ach client **12a-12n** can generate resource requests over the network **14** to access the resources **18a-18n** managed by the server” and “[t]he resource-request **32** includes the authorization credentials **13** which are used by the server **16** to determine whether the client has the permission to access the requested resource(s)” (Col. 1, line 65 – Col. 2, line 4). Moreover, Lortz discloses that “[t]he authorization framework **23** includes a resource authorization data structure (resource structure) **26** which is used to establish a relationship between symbolic resource names corresponding to each resource and can include other resource authorization related information” (Col. 2, lines 30-34). Lortz further discloses that “[a] resource manager...may be responsible for mapping resource requests **32** generated by the clients to the appropriate resource related information necessary to satisfy the request” and that “[t]he results of the mapping operation can be communicated to an authorization service **27** by issuing a resource inquiry requests **34** over a path **35**” (Col. 2, lines 35-43).

[0014] Furthermore, Applicant submits that Lortz discloses that “[t]he authorization service **27** executes a program that is responsible for determining whether the client **12a** that generated the resource request **32** is authorized to access the requested

resource **18a-18n**” and “[t]he service **27** searches the resource structure **26** and verifies whether the client **12a** has the proper authorization credentials **13** accompanying the resource request **32**” (Col. 2, lines 44-50). Lortz further discloses that “[t]he administrator **17**, acting as a policy author, can access the resource manager **25** to construct the resource structure **26** based on a set of authorization policies related to the resources **18a-18n**” and such “policies can identify what authorization levels the clients **12a-12n** need to have to perform the requested operation included in the resource request **32**” (Col. 2, lines 51-56).

[0015] Despite the foregoing, however, it is respectfully submitted that Lortz neither discloses nor suggests “the determining including searching for an entry in a registry that provides a path to a configuration file, the configuration file specifying possible methods that can be performed by a plurality of client users and where the server administrator can add an entry for each of the plurality of client users,” as presently recited. Instead, Lortz merely discloses “determining whether the client that generated the resource request is authorized to access the requested resource” and that the “service searches the resource structure and verifies whether the client has the proper authorization credentials accompanying the resource request” (Col. 2, lines 44-50; reference numbers omitted). Moreover, Applicant submits that Lortz discloses “a set of authorization policies” that “can identify what authorization levels the clients need to have to perform the requested operation” (Col. 2, lines 51-56; reference numbers omitted) without “specifying possible methods that can be performed by a plurality of client users” and without identifying “where the server administrator can add an entry for each of the plurality of client users,” as presently recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 is patentable over Lortz.

[0016] Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Brezak and Srinivasan neither remedies the deficiencies in Lortz set forth above, nor does the Action make any assertions to that effect. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 is patentable over Lortz, Brezak, and Srinivasan, both singularly and in combination with one another.

Independent Claims 13, 23, and 34

[0017] Independent Claims 13, 23, and 34 recite features similar to those discussed above with regard to independent Claim 1, which is patentable over the combination of Lortz, Brezak, and Srinivasan for at least the foregoing reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 13, 23, and 34 are also patentable over Lortz, Brezak, and Srinivasan, both singularly and in combination with one another, for at least the reasons set forth above.

Dependent Claims 2, 4-12, 15-22, 24, 26-33, and 36-38

[0018] As stated above, independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34 are patentable over Lortz in view of Brezak, in further view of Srinivasan. Accordingly, dependent Claims 2, 4-12, 15-22, 24, 26-33, and 36-38 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34, as well as for the additional features that Claims 2, 4-12, 15-22, 24, 26-33, and 36-38 recite.

Claims 6, 11, 15, 17, 21, 26, 28, 32, 36, and 37 are Non-Obvious over Lortz in view of Brezak, in further view of Srinivasan, in further view of Krishnan

[0019] Claims 6, 11, 15, 17, 21, 26, 28, 32, 36, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Lortz in view of Brezak, in further view of Srinivasan, in further view of Krishnan. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0020] As stated above, independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34 are patentable over Lortz in view of Brezak, in further view of Srinivasan. Furthermore, Krishnan neither remedies the deficiencies in Lortz, Brezak, and Srinivasan noted above with respect to independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34, nor does the rejection make any arguments to that effect. As a result, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34 are patentable over Lortz, Brezak, Srinivasan, and Krishnan, both singularly and in combination with one another. Accordingly, dependent Claims 6, 11, 15, 17, 21, 26, 28, 32, 36, and 37 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34, as well as for the additional features that each claim recites.

[0021] Thus, Lortz, Brezak, Srinivasan, and Krishnan, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose or suggest the recitations of independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34 are patentable over the proposed combination of references. Furthermore, dependent Claims 2, 4-12, 15-22, 24, 26-33, and 36-38 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34, as well as for the additional features that each claim recites. Applicant also

respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

[0022] Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-24, 26-34, and 36-38 are not obvious over the various combinations of Lortz, Brezak, Srinivasan, and Krishnan, and therefore, the present rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

[0023] For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-24, 26-34, and 36-38 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

[0024] The arguments and amendments presented herein were necessitated by the most recent Office Action and could not have been presented previously because the Final Office Action rejected claims based on a new prior art reference not previously of record. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Brett J. Schlameus/ _____ Dated: 12/18/2009
Brett J. Schlameus (brett@leehayes.com; 206-876-6022)
Registration No. 60827

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert C. Peck (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)
Registration No. 56826